OK AOUS

Amercan Association of University Professors - 10 June 1978

Second Speaker - Admiral Stansfield Turner, Director of Central Intelligence

Good morning, good afternoon. In thinking about being with you here today, I was struck by the commonality of our profession. The intelligence profession, the academic profession are both founded on good research and searching out information. They're both founded on analyzing that information, interpreting it, adding to the fund of knowledge available. They're both founded on publishing that data, making it available to those who need it so they can draw better conclusions in whatever line of work they are engaged. In our country there is a similarity because in the non-governmental sector there's a greater concentration of research skills as identified by a PhD in the academic community than anywhere else; in the governmental sector that concentration is in the intelligence community. We have more PhD's than anyone else in the government. This commonality means in my view that we have a good enough foundation for a more comfortable, a more mutually supportive relationship than has existed in recent years. I happen to believe that a more mutually supportive relationship between us is particularly important to the United States of America today. Why? Because good intelligence is more important today than at any time since World War II. Your contribution to it can be significant and entirely proper.

Why is it more important that we have good intelligence? Thirty years ago we had absolute military superiority. Today we are in the position of mere parity. Clearly, the leverage of knowing other people's capability and intentions in the military sphere is much greater when you are at a

position of mere parity. Thirty years ago we were totally independent economically. Today we are clearly interdependent with many other countries. It is much more important today that we know what is going on and what is going to happen in the economic sphere than it was thirty years ago. Thirty years ago we were a dominant political power and many smaller nations took their cue from us automatically. Today not only do those nations not take cues from anybody, but there are many many more of them. Pick up your morning papers and read about a country you never heard of a decade ago. It's everyday in that way. Why, though, must we obtain information about the military, political and economic activities through intelligence? For the simple reasons that we are blessed by living in the most open society the world has ever known. But most of the nations of the world do not enjoy that privilege. And yet the activities of those closed societies have tremendous import and impact on our military, political and economic well being.

For instance, would anyone in this room even think of concluding an agreement on strategic arms limitation with the Soviet Union if we could not assure you from the intelligence side that we could check and verify whether that agreement is being carried out. This isn't a question of whether you trust the Soviets; whether you have confidence that they will do what they say. The stakes are too high in this particular game for any country to put its total fate in the hands of someone else without any ability to check on them.

So, too, with the many other negotiations in which our government is engaged today in an attempt to reduce the threshold of the probability of

resort to arms. Mutual and balanced force reductions in Europe; anti-satellite negotiations; comprehensive test bans on nuclear weapons testing; reductions in conventional arms sales around the world - all of these are founded on good intelligence.

But much more than the military sphere is at stake. Our country stands for increased international economic growth, narrowing the gap between the under-priviledged nations of the southern hemisphere and those of us to the North. And yet, here too, you need good economic information. You need not be surprised by a closed society like the Soviet Union that entered the grain market in 1973 in a way that disturbs all of our economies and yours and my pocketbook.

The CIA today publishes unclassified estimates. One last summer on the future of the Soviet economy, trying to inform everyone what to expect from that closed society, saying that they are going to have some problems in the decade ahead. Problems which will lead to pressures that will keep them from entering the international market as much as they are today we believe, and therefore impact on American business. We've had a study that was published on the international energy situation - that said that over the next decade the demand for oil out of the ground will be greater than the amount we can physically get out; not that it's not down there, but than we can get out. Therefore, there are bound to be increased pressures on prices and there will be restriction on economic growth. If we are going to combat, as we would like to in this country, a war on international terrorism, you simply have to penetrate and find out what is going on in international terrorist organizations. We do that from an intelligence

base. If we are going to conduct the war on international drug trafficking, you have to do much the same kinds of things.

And in the international political sphere, if you're an interventionist, an activist, you want the United States to get involved, or if you're a pacifist and you don't want the United States to get involved, you simply have to have good information as a foundation for your policy in one direction or the other.

Hence, this country must have today, some organization, call it the CIA or whatever you will, that can operate overseas, openly and clandestinely in order to gain the information that our policymakers need.

Today, however, the rules and the players have changed. Your intelligence community is under the tightest control and is operating more openly than ever before. We are, in my opinion, in an exciting period, an exciting experiment, in which we are evolving a new, uniquely American model of intelligence. What are these controls? What are these checks and balances that Bill refered to that we now have and did not have when the Church Committee report was written?

One, you have myself, the Director of Central Intelligence, with strengthened authority today. New authority to bring together all of the intelligence activities of our country, not just those of the CIA. And my personal conviction that the Intelligence Community will and must operate in conformance with the laws of this country and with its moral standards; and that it must cooperate fully with the oversight bodies that have been established.

What are those oversight bodies? What are those checks and balances built into the governmental structure? First is the President and the

Vice President who today take a very active and strong interest in our intelligence activities and supervise them closely.

Secondly, there is something known as the Intelligence Oversight Board; three distinguished citizens appointed by the President reporting only to him and to whom you or any of our employees can communicate directly. Call them up, write them and say you think Admiral Turner's off on a bad tack. They will investigate it; report only to the President.

Byond that there is a new role in the Justice Department; new regulations which they write and tell me how I may go about conducting my business.

And finally, there are two very rigorous oversight committees of the Congress; one in each chamber. And I can tell you having been on the hill for over twelve hours this last week that they hold me to the task. They interrogate me, we provide them detailed information and they know what is going on. In addition to this, I rely very much on the American public as a form of control on our intelligence activities. So today we are responding more to the media; we are coming more to academic conferences and symposiums, writing papers and supporting your activities. We are lecturing more; we are participating more in panels like this - and we are publishing more; we're publishing all that we can legally declassify and still find that we have a value to the American public. And any university or college that is not subscribing to the Library of Congress for $255 a year to all the publications that we put out from the CIA, an average of two a week on an unclassified basis, is missing one of the greatest source bargains in the world. We have the Freedom of Information Act and a greater declassification program. These are not just a public

relations gimmick, these are founded in a sincere conviction that the better informed the American public is on issues of national interest, the stronger our democracy will be.

We want particularly, however, to share with the academic community. On the one hand because we need you. We need, as any research organization does, outside scrutiny to ask, are we seeing the woods for the trees? Are we making those same old assumptions year after year? Are we mired in our own thinking? Is our analysis rigorous? On the other hand, I think there is an untapped potential for the academic community from the world of intelligence. Our new sophisticated technical means of collecting intelligence has all kinds of potential for you as well as for us. I just learned the other day, for instance, that there's tremendous potential for archeology in our aerial photography capability; an ability to get to archeological ruins that are politically or geographically unaccessible and even to find more when you're there than you can get on the ground. We're anxious to share if we can in spheres like this. At the same time we're anxious to have you share with us your expertise, your knowledge, because we have a basic principle. We do not want to risk and spend money to go out overseas and clandestinely collect information when it is openly available inside our own society. So whatever connections with you, and not only with you but the entire American public, is an informal connection to try to ask questions and find out what people have learned if they have traveled abroad as they have studied or they've done research. And this includes informal consulting in areas of academic and scientific, technical expertise.

Beyond them we do have formal, contractual paid relationships with consultants, or for providing information. These are normally open unless the recipient, the person with whom we contract wants them to be kept confidential. We want the universities, in the cases of academics, to be informed. But clearly the relationship between the individual professor and the university is the relationship between them and not between us and the universities.

We agree that if a university like Bill's requires that all outside commitments of academic members be reported to the administration the CIA should be no acception. We disagree, however, that the CIA relationship should be singled out uniquely as it is in the Harvard guidelines which assumes that only a relationship with the CIA would endanger the professor's or the school's integrity. With all the opportunities today for conflict of interest we think that is a naive assumption.

Beyond the exchange of information in both directions, it should be obvious that we in the intelligence community are just as dependent as the American business community and the American academic community itself on recruiting good U.S. students, graduates of our universities and our colleges. We can't exist over time without an annual imput of a relatively few of the high quality of American university graduates. We recruit today openly on about 150 different campuses just like businesses or other government agencies. I am sorry to have to tell you that there are a few campuses on which we are denied the right to have free communications and free associations.

In addition, the CIA needs to contract with some foreign students in our country, some very few of the 120,000 of these students. And despite malicious stories otherwise, let me assure you that all such contracts are without

coercion, are entirely free, and entirely a matter of choice with individual foreign students.

Let me sum up by saying that in intelligence in our country today we operate under two imperatives. The first is to recognize that the juxtaposition of open and closed societies in our world has dangers for the open society. Now there is not one of us here who would trade the short term advantages that accrue to a closed society for the blessings of openness and respect for the individual human being that we have in our society and we all have faith that that is a long term strength of great advantage. But at the same time we cannot be so naive as to think that we can forego collecting information about these closed societies without giving them undue and unnecessary advantage.

Our second imperative is to recognize that the basic purpose of intelligence in our country is to support and defend its free institutions. We attempt to do that by providing the most comprehensive, the most reliable data we can to the President, to the Congress, to some extent to the American public so that the best decisions for all of us can be made. In my view, it would make no sense whatsoever for us to jeopardize any of those free institutions in the process of collecting that information. I assure you that we are dedicated to conducting intelligence in the United States in ways that will only strengthen the basic institutions, the basic standards of our country. Thank you.